



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,508	03/17/2004	Leonard Joseph Gojer		8564
7590	05/22/2006		EXAMINER	
LEONARD GOJER 10802 BRANCH OAKS CR DALLAS, TX 75230			MONDT, JOHANNES P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3663	

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/717,508	GOJER, LEONARD JOSEPH
	Examiner Johannes P. Mondt	Art Unit 3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/26/04.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in response to the filing of the application.

### ***Drawings***

The subject matter of this application admits of illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. No drawings have been found in the application. Applicant is required to furnish a drawing under 37 CFR 1.81(c). No new matter may be introduced in the required drawing. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

### ***Specification***

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

- The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because applicant's abstract is neither concise nor comprehensible, while referring to purported merits and speculative applications. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
- Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc., including the phrase "It describes", "The invention works", etc., used in applicant's abstract.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

#### **Arrangement of the Specification**

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.

- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or  
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
  - (1) Field of the Invention.
  - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

**Content of Specification**

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) The Names Of The Parties To A Joint Research Agreement: See 37 CFR 1.71(g).
- (e) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.  
Or alternatively, Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix": See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.
- (f) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:
  - (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."
  - (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."
- (g) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point

out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.

(h) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.

(i) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.

(j) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet or electronic page (37 CFR 1.52(b)(3)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).

(k) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).

(l) Sequence Listing: See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. ***The Specification is objected to*** because the written description is

both (a) insufficient in its description of the claimed fusion reactor and  
(b) fails to provide enablement for the claimed invention.

A major contribution to both currents and fields originates from the motion of both ions and electrons in the plasma in response to, and yet also contributing to, the electromagnetic fields. The stability properties of the

configuration of electric and magnetic fields with the plasma have not been discussed, yet stability is of major concern for toroidal pinch type configurations as evidenced for instance by Alper, Physics of Fluids B2(6), June 1990, pages 1338-1341); nor has the net yield of energy, i.e., retrievable fusion energy minus energy required to reach and maintain the necessary plasma density and ion temperature, been described, although applicant includes a major limitation in that regard ("fusion reactor", final sentence). Therefore, from the Specification it is not clear whether the ion temperature can reach the threshold for thermonuclear fusion (depending on the specific nuclei participating in the nuclear fusion reaction, but at least several tens of millions degrees (C or K), see L. A. Artsimovich, "Controlled Thermonuclear Reactions", Gordon & Breach Science Publishers, New York, English Edition 1964, pages 1-9; see for instance Figure 7 illustrating the ratio of energy released by thermonuclear reactions to that lost by one source of loss, i.e., Bremsstrahlung losses, i.e., radiation and, consequently heat losses due to deceleration of charge carriers resulting from their interaction at high relative velocities; other heat sinks are just as important, e.g., plasma-wall interaction and the accumulation of helium ash), nor is it clear from the Specification whether Lawson's criterion for achieving a net energy output from a thermonuclear reactor is met (see, e.g., J.D. Lawson, Proc. Phys. Soc. B70, 6-10 (1957)). Moreover, aforementioned threshold for ion temperature and Lawson's criterion should be achieved *simultaneously*.

*A written description* and the provision of enablement of the claimed invention (*ad (a) above*) is lacking at least for the above reasons.

*With regard to enablement* (*ad (b) above*) it is further noted that the achievement of a fusion reactor has been an as yet unachieved objective of intensive research and development worldwide over the last half a century, and thus far this effort has still not met the objective exactly because of the problems of stability and heating / heat loss described above despite an increased consensus of its urgency; see, for instance "International Research Co-operation in the Field of Controlled Thermonuclear Fusion, 25<sup>th</sup> Report covering 2002, by the Federal Office for Education and Science; see also the position statement of the IEEE-USA Board of Directors (June 1999), entitled "Fusion Energy Research and Development"). In view of the nature of the invention, i.e., a fusion reactor, generally recognized as a major yet unachieved, milestone to solve the world's energy resource problems, and given the state of the prior art and the level of ordinary skill in the art of thermonuclear fusion at present as not being able to satisfy the aforementioned necessary conditions for ion temperature and density, given also the level of predictability in the art, which must need be described as poor from an *a priori*, i.e., experimentally untested, point of departure as a history of repeated setbacks in the worldwide fusion research and development effort has demonstrated, and, finally, given the lack of an adequate written description tantamount to zero direction by the inventor and

no working examples being detailed in any reasonable sense of the word, there is no doubt that undue experimentation is required to practice the invention. In conclusion, with reference to MPEP 2164.01(a) the claimed invention is not enabled by the Specification. Finally, the showing of a credible asserted utility or well-established utility of the invention is clearly failing in light the above-noted lack of enablement, credibility being absent in view of the lack of an adequate description and of enablement of the claimed invention in conjunction with its nature, the state and level of predictability of the art and the need for undue experimentation as explained overleaf.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. The claim of inventor is objected to because any sheet including a claim or portion of a claim may not contain any other parts of the application or other material (MPEP 608.01(m)).
3. The claim is objected to because of the following informalities: the wording "thi" on line 1 should be replaced by "the"; the wording "it's" on line 1 should be replaced by "its"; and the wording "sin wave" on lines 6-7, 9-10, should be replaced by "sine wave". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. ***The claim by inventor is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph***, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. See objection to the Specification under section 1 above in this office action incorporated herewith.
5. ***The claim by inventor is furthermore rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph***, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim contains subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. See objection to the Specification under section 1 above in this office action incorporated herewith.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. ***The claim by inventor is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph***, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, "wave-form" (line 1) is indefinite, not being defined in the claim, nor has "wave-form" been defined in the Specification. "Wave-form" necessarily has to be defined as an attribute of a physical parameter, such as current, voltage, magnetic field, electric field, or

electromagnetic field, for instance. Absent the physical parameter of which said “wave-form” is an attribute, “wave-form” is indefinite. Neither does applicant explain how a wave-form can be “passing through” wires; in any reasonable interpretation, “wave-form” merely is a functional form of the time dependence of a physical quantity. That said physical quantity can be claimed to pass through wires is a different matter altogether.

2. A second, independent reason for indefiniteness is that the wave-form is claimed to be “the invention of the inventor” (lines 1-2), all other features being “public domain knowledge” (lines 2-5), whereas subsequently in the same claim the “topology (of the wires) is the factor that produces a successful design of the fusion reactor”; however, in any reasonable interpretation of “wave-form” and “topology” the former pertains to the time dependence and the latter to the spatial dependence, implying a bewildering contradiction in what is claimed to be the novel feature of the claimed invention.
3. The claim by inventor recites the limitation ““the wave-form” (in line 1). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
4. The claim by inventor recites the limitation “the intention of the wave-form” (in lines 4-5). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
5. The claim by inventor recites the limitation ““the patent” (in line 3). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. The claim by inventor recites the limitation ""the desired field" (in line 11). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. The claim by inventor recites the limitation ""the topology of the wires" (in line 20). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. The claim by inventor is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility.

The claimed invention is not supported by the Specification, which fails to show neither a credible asserted utility nor a well established utility, with reference to the objection to the Specification under section 1 above.

Said claim also is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above under section 1 on objections to the Specification, herewith incorporated, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. ***The claim is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)*** as being anticipated by Ohkawa (4,560,528) henceforth abbreviated by Ohkawa\_1, as well as by Ohkawa (4,543,231), the latter henceforth abbreviated by Ohkawa\_2. These rejections are provided subject to the noted indefiniteness under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and lack of enablement of the claimed fusion reactor, and merely serves to show that the apparatus to the extent as claimed with regard to its definite attributes is in the prior art.

Ohkawa\_1 teaches an apparatus comprising a magnetic bottle (abstract, first sentence, “magnetic well” meets the claim limitation “magnetic bottle”) while the “wave-form”, whether of external magnetic fields, currents in the wires inherently needed to produce said external magnetic fields, electric fields, or electromagnetic fields, being analytical in the spatial domain of the confined plasma, can inherently be accurately approximated by a Fourier decomposition in sine waves on account of the completeness of the set of harmonic functions in the space of analytical functions. The pinch effect, i.e., confinement through the motion of charge carriers in the self-field of the plasma, is indeed operative (column 11, lines 32-45) on the hydrogen ions (column 10, line 21). The toroidal magnetic field coils 58 (column 12, lines 28-48) of Ohkawa\_1 meet the claimed “coils of electromagnets”. The physical dimensions are inherently variable, i.e., they can be varied in any design, if only because the laws of electromagnetic fields and the response of ions and electrons yield relations between

fields and particle quantities such as density, temperature, pressure, heat tensor, etc., that are characterized by continuous functions. The topology of the wires is not defined, being without antecedent basis in the claim, and hence the limitation "the topology of the wires" does not carry patentable weight. The limitation "the only limiting criteria being how much energy does the designer want to produce" and the limitation on "successful design of a fusion reactor" are not enabled, as explained under the objection to the specification and the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, and constitute a major difficulty in patentability subject to the use of the apparatus as claimed.

Ohkawa\_2 teaches an apparatus comprising a magnetic bottle (abstract, first sentence, "magnetic well" meets the claim limitation "magnetic bottle") while the "wave-form", whether of external magnetic fields, currents in the wires inherently needed to produce said external magnetic fields, electric fields, or electromagnetic fields, being analytical in the spatial domain of the confined plasma, can inherently be accurately approximated by a Fourier decomposition in sine waves on account of the completeness of the set of harmonic functions in the space of analytical functions. The pinch effect, i.e., confinement through the motion of charge carriers in the self-field of the plasma, is indeed operative (column 7, lines 1-15) on the hydrogen ions (column 7, line 62). The toroidal magnetic field coils 58 (column 10, lines 7-18) of Ohkawa\_2 meet the claimed "coils of electromagnets". The physical dimensions are inherently variable, i.e., they can be varied in any design, if only because the laws of electromagnetic fields and the response of ions and electrons yield relations between fields and particle

quantities such as density, temperature, pressure, heat tensor, etc., that are characterized by continuous functions. The topology of the wires is not defined, being without antecedent basis in the claim, and hence the limitation "the topology of the wires" does not carry patentable weight. The limitation "the only limiting criteria being how much energy does the designer want to produce" and the limitation on "successful design of a fusion reactor" are not enabled, as explained under the objection to the specification and the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, and constitute a major difficulty in patentability subject to the use of the apparatus as claimed.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johannes P. Mondt whose telephone number is 571-272-1919. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 18:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack W. Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JPM  
May 16, 2006

Patent Examiner:



Johannes Mondt (Art Unit: 3663)